The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM.

3 Public Comment

None

4 Approval of Minutes (For Possible Action)

4.1 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - Dec 4, 2014 6:00 PM (For Possible Action) 6:03 PM

It was moved by Commissioner Coffman, seconded by Commissioner Weiske, to approve the December 4, 2014, minutes. The motion carried with four (4) in favor and two (2) abstentions by Commissioners Gower and Woosley.
RESULT: ACCEPTED [4 TO 0]
MOVER: Doug D. Coffman, Commissioner
SECONDER: Kevin Weiske, Vice-Chair
AYES: Doug D. Coffman, Charles Reno, Kevin Weiske, Paul Olivas
ABSTAIN: Jason Woosley, Peter Gower
ABSENT: Kathleen Taylor

5 City Council Liaison Reports
None

6 Public Hearings

6.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Case No. LDC15-00038 (Reno Student Housing) - A request has been made for a zoning map amendment to change the zoning designation from Multifamily–30 units per acre/West University Neighborhood Plan Overlay (MF30/WUNP) on ±.39 acres and Multifamily–14 units per acre/West University Neighborhood Plan Overlay (MF14/WUNP) on ±.36 acres to Mixed Use/University of Nevada Regional Center Planning Area Overlay (MU/UNRC) on two adjoining parcels. The ±.75 acre subject site is located on the west side of North Virginia Street, ±200 feet north of its intersection with 15th Street (1551 North Virginia Street) in the Special Planning Area/University of Nevada Regional Center/Residential Master Plan land use designation.

Amanda Mauzey, Caron Architecture, gave a presentation on the application for a zoning map amendment. The development team, Fields Holdings, designs student housing in prime locations near campuses. A project site map was displayed, which included information on how each of the following zone change findings are met: Growth and Redevelopment Factors; Services and Infrastructure; Appropriate Proposed Use; Conformance with Master Plan; and Compatibility with Adjacent Properties. The project site is situated within the North Virginia Street TOD Corridor Plan and the University of Nevada Regional Center Plan. Each of those plans supports the following ideals: higher densities; a diverse neighborhood environment; and further connection of pedestrian activities. The goals of this project are to enhance the pedestrian experience with the adjacency to the campus, help facilitate the reduction of automobile use, and relieve pressure on the surrounding neighborhoods by providing more student housing. Past projects done by Fields Holdings were reviewed.

Eran Fields, Fields Holdings, was available to answer questions.

Nathan Gilbert, Associate Planner, concurred with the applicant's presentation. The University Plan identifies the subject site as appropriate for the Mixed Use (MU)
University of Nevada Regional Center (UNRC) Plan. Staff can make the applicable findings.

The Commissioners present disclosed that they have visited the site and received emails.

At this time, Chairman Woosley opened public comment for this item.

Frankie Sue DelPapa expressed concern regarding the lack of sufficient parking at the University.

David Howard spoke regarding the need for discussion of the parking issue in this neighborhood.

Seeing and hearing no further public comment requests, Chairman Woosley closed public comment.

Mr. Gilbert confirmed for Commissioner Coffman that the parking issue would be discussed once a project is brought before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Reno asked how many units could be added on the property with the zone change.

Mr. Gilbert stated that the existing MF30/WUNP zoning has no residential density cap, but it does not allow for any parking reduction, and it has a 45 foot high cap.

Commissioner Weiske asked about parking requirements for possible uses if the zone change is approved.

Mr. Gilbert stated the City of Reno has base parking requirements for different types of uses. The MU/UNRC zone allows the option, with a parking study, to reduce what would otherwise be required parking.

Commissioners Weiske and Reno asked about the process for a permitted use if this zoning change is made.

Mr. Gilbert confirmed that if a Special Use Permit (SUP) is not required, a proposed project would not come before the Planning Commission but could be approved at the staff level. A 50% reduction of parking would also be possible with an approved parking study.
Commissioner Weiske requested input from the applicant's representative regarding the potential parking issues.

Mr. Fields stated that the first 2 floors of this project would probably be designated for parking, and that he is open to having a dialogue with the community about the amount of parking that should be included in this building.

Commissioner Reno stated that as far as the zone change is concerned he can make the findings.

Commissioner Gower agreed that the zoning change findings can be made, and felt that there was good feedback and information from the community and the applicant. Housing where students can walk to the University makes sense and a broader dialogue might be needed to address the community's parking concerns.

Commissioner Coffman stated he can also make the findings, especially I, J and L.

Commissioner Weiske stated that he can now make the findings. This zone change will allow staff and the developer to work through the issues regarding parking analysis and will assure that the community is protected.

It was moved by Commissioner Coffman, seconded by Commissioner Gower, in the case of LDC15-00038 (Reno Student Housing), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to recommend that City Council approve the zoning map amendment by ordinance. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Doug D. Coffman, Commissioner
SECONDER: Peter Gower, Commissioner
AYES: Woosley, Coffman, Reno, Weiske, Olivas, Gower
ABSENT: Kathleen Taylor

6.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC15-00040 (SS Smoke and Liquor) - A request has been made for a special use permit to establish a convenience store use in an existing building. The ±3,441 square foot site is located on the northeast corner of the South Wells Avenue/Broadway Boulevard intersection (301 Broadway Boulevard) in the Community Commercial/Wells Avenue Mixed Use (CC/MU) zone. The site has Master Plan land use designations of Special Planning Area/Wells Avenue Neighborhood Plan/Mixed Use. vak [Ward 3] 6:37 PM
Patty Steelman, applicant's representative, reviewed details of the request. The applicant intends to move his convenience store across the street from its current location on Wells Avenue. There is sufficient parking for approximately 1,400 square feet of storefront. The applicant intends to install security cameras and better security lighting. The applicant currently sells tobacco products and adult materials, which will not be transferred to the new store location. The applicant is willing to surrender his package liquor license at the old location when he gets a license for the new store.

Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, presented the request and findings. The addition of Condition No. 10, as stated in the memo provided to the Planning Commission, requires the applicant to surrender the packaged liquor license at 1475 S. Wells. Several concerns were included in emails that were provided to the Commission. The proposed conditions address those concerns. With the recommendations and conditions, staff believes the findings can be made and recommends approval.

The Commissioners present disclosed that they have received emails and visited the site.

At this time, Chairman Woosley opened public comment for this item.

Reddy Narala provided a comment card in favor of the request.

Patty Steelman provided a comment card in favor of the request.

Delwin Rice spoke in opposition to the SUP request and expressed concern regarding graffiti issues.

Mark Rissone, 141 E Pueblo, spoke regarding graffiti and safety issues on his property in this area.

Seeing and hearing no further public comment requests, Chairman Woosley closed public comment.

Commissioner Weiske requested information on code enforcement issues at the proposed site.

Alex Woodley, Code Enforcement Manager for the City of Reno, stated that he has also received emails and inquiries from citizens. One of the perceptions is that there have been a lot of calls for service or problems with this particular business. There have been no code enforcement cases or notes for any kind of complaints called in to Reno Direct for the last 12 months for this location. The Business License Division also has no record
of any incidences or disciplinary action taken by the City with regard to the business license.

Commissioner Coffman asked about current Code for signage hanging outside buildings.

Mr. Woodley stated that right now they are looking at revising the Code for on-premise signage for the Wells Avenue area.

Mr. Kloos stated that signs on the inside of windows are not regulated. No permits are required and there are no restrictions. Temporary signs on the outside of buildings are regulated by Code and permits are required.

Commissioner Weiske asked if the applicant is aware of Condition No. 6 regarding the sale of adult materials being prohibited, and Condition No. 7 regarding the sale of tobacco paraphernalia being prohibited.

Mr. Narala confirmed that he is aware of the conditions placed on the project.

Commissioner Gower asked about the square footage occupied by alcohol in the existing store.

Mr. Woodley confirmed that approximately 10% of the square footage in the current location is occupied by alcohol.

Commissioner Weiske stated that with the addition of Condition No. 10 he can make all the findings.

Commissioner Gower suggested an additional Condition that the liquor space occupied in the store be limited to 10% of the total square footage.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Housing Manager, clarified that Conditions can be added but need to be related to a finding.

Commissioner Coffman stated that with the Conditions he can make the findings and will support the project.

Commissioner Reno stated this project will enhance the neighborhood and he can make the findings with the Conditions.

Commissioner Olivas stated this will be an improvement in the neighborhood and he will support the project.
Commissioner Reno stated he would support an additional Condition addressing Commissioner Gower's comments regarding limiting the liquor storage area.

Ms. Steelman stated that the applicant has no intentions of expanding liquor sales and the additional Condition would not be an issue.

Condition 10
Prior to issuance of a business license to operate the convenience store for this case, the applicant shall provide suitable verification from City Business License staff that the business license for privileged alcoholic beverage sales at 1475 South Wells Avenue has been surrendered.

Condition 11
Prior to issuance of a business license to operate the convenience store for this case, the applicant shall provide suitable verification to staff that no more than 10% of the convenience store sales floor area contains package liquor sales. This restriction shall apply for the lifetime of this special use permit.

It was moved by Commissioner Gower, seconded by Commissioner Reno, in the case of LDC15-00040 (SS Smoke and Liquor), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to approve the SUP, subject to Conditions with the addition of Condition 10 as provided in the memo, and Condition 11 to limit the square footage of the store space dedicated to the retail sales of alcohol to ten percent (10%) to meet Finding A. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Peter Gower, Commissioner
SECONDER: Charles Reno, Commissioner
AYES: Woosley, Coffman, Reno, Weiske, Olivas, Gower
ABSENT: Kathleen Taylor

6.3 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Case No. LDC15-00041 (Urban @ University) - A request has been made for a zoning map amendment to change the zoning designation from Multifamily – 30 units per acre/West University Neighborhood Plan Overlay (MF30/WUNP) to Mixed Use/University of Nevada Regional Center Planning Area Overlay (MU/UNRC) on two adjoining parcels. The ±.24 acre subject site is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of West 10th Street and North Virginia Street (935 and 941 North Virginia Street) in the Special Planning Area/University of Nevada Regional Center/Residential Master Plan land use designation. njg [Ward 5] 7:14 PM
Garrett Gordon, applicant's representative, reviewed information regarding the requested zone change. The applicant met with the property owner directly adjacent to the west and that property owner submitted an email to staff indicating their support. The applicant agrees with staff's analysis and recommendation of approval. This property is pre-leased with uses that are compatible with the University area.

Nathan Gilbert, Associate Planner, concurred with the applicant's presentation and stated that parking will be verified at the time of either tenant improvement or business license review.

Chairman Woosley and Commissioner Weiske disclosed that they visited the site and spoke with the applicant's representative. Commissioners Reno, Olivas, and Coffman disclosed that they visited the site. Commissioner Gower stated that he did not visit the site.

At this time, Chairman Woosley opened public comment for this item.

Chairman Woosley read written comments submitted by David Howard in opposition to this request.

"Construction of more student housing without more student parking poses a continued burden on current residents."

Seeing and hearing no further public comment requests, Chairman Woosley closed public comment.

There was discussion regarding potential parking issues. Mr. Gilbert confirmed that any allowable reduction in required parking is an administrative decision and would only be brought back to the Planning Commission if they are unable to meet minimum parking requirements.

It was moved by Commissioner Weiske, seconded by Commissioner Reno, in the case of LDC15-00041 (Urban @ University), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to recommend that City Council approve the zoning map amendment by ordinance. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.
RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Kevin Weiske, Vice-Chair
SECONDER: Charles Reno, Commissioner
AYES: Woosley, Coffman, Reno, Weiske, Olivas, Gower
ABSENT: Kathleen Taylor

6.4 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC15-00037 (Reno Skilled Nursing Facility) - A request has been made for a special use permit to establish a Nursing Home/Assisted Living Facility use in the Multifamily-14 units per acre (MF14) zone. The site contains the west ±4.56 acres of a ±12.3 acre parcel located on the north side of Sharlands Avenue, ±1,200 feet east of its intersection with Robb Drive. The site has Master Plan land use designations of Special Planning Area/McQueen Neighborhood Plan/Mixed Residential. vak [Ward 1]

7:24 PM

Derek Wilson, Rubicon Design Group, representing the applicant, reviewed information regarding the SUP request. The project is residential in character and would be a great fit for the neighborhood. The project is not a big traffic or noise generator and is compatible with the surrounding development. Mr. Wilson stated he had an informal discussion with City Council Member Brekhus who stated she would like to see the project address pedestrian connectivity. This project will in no way disrupt pedestrian use and will provide a more formalized connection.

Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, stated that staff can make all the findings and is available to answer questions.

Commissioner Reno disclosed that he visited the site and spoke with Council Member Brekhus. Commissioner Weiske disclosed that he visited the site and spoke with the applicant's representative. Chairman Woosley and Commissioners Olivas and Coffman disclosed that they visited the site.

At this time, Chairman Woosley opened public comment for this item. Seeing and hearing no public comment requests, Chairman Woosley closed public comment.

Commissioner Reno asked if this is a phase project intending to expand the facility to the east.

Mr. Wilson stated there has been no discussion with the owner about an expansion of the facility. It will be parcelled and the remaining site is open for development but no project has been seen for that at this time.

Commissioner Reno expressed the desire to keep walkability in the area intact.
Mr. Kloos stated that the site is private property and conditioning walkability would not be appropriate at this time. When it is developed and the street goes through, a sidewalk will be required.

Commissioner Gower asked about plans for the road for this phase of the development.

Mr. Kloos stated that a turnaround will be provided with development of the project. That turnaround would be removed when the street goes through.

*It was moved by Commissioner Weiske, seconded by Commissioner Coffman, in the case of LDC15-00037 (Reno Skilled Nursing Facility), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to approve the SUP, subject to conditions. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.*

| RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS] |
| MOVER: Kevin Weiske, Vice-Chair |
| SECONDER: Doug D. Coffman, Commissioner |
| AYES: Woosley, Coffman, Reno, Weiske, Olivas, Gower |
| ABSENT: Kathleen Taylor |

6.5 **Resolution No.** : Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Resolution No. 04-15 Case No. LDC15-00035 (0 Lemmon Drive & 0 Military Road MPA/ZMA) - A request has been made for: 1) a Master Plan amendment to change the land use designation from Parks/Recreation/Open Space on ±25.63 acres and Mixed Residential on ±105.15 acres to Parks/Recreation/Open Space on ±25.03 acres and Industrial on ±105.75 acres; and 2) a zoning map amendment to change the zoning from Arterial Commercial (AC) on ±.17 acres, Large Lot Residential – 2.5 Acres (LLR2.5) on ±24.91 acres, Single Family Residential – 4,000 square feet (SF4) on ±26.12 acres and Single Family Residential – 6,000 square feet (SF6) on ±79.58 acres to Open Space (OS) on ±25.03 acres and Industrial Commercial (IC) on ±105.75 acres. The subject area includes four parcels totaling ±130.78 acres located east of Military Road and west of Lemmon Drive, ±.36 miles north of their intersection. **[Ward 4]**

Ken Krater, representing Dermody Properties, reviewed information regarding the proposed amendments. This site provides a great opportunity to bring economic development to the City of Reno. This site provides the opportunity for close to 1.5 million square feet of industrial development and all the jobs associated with that. Changing the zoning to Open Space on the hillside will match the Parks Recreation and Open Space within the land use designation. The population in the North Valleys
provides a stable labor base. This project also provides a significant reduction in impacts to the North Valleys. Traffic would be cut in half from what was previously proposed with the tentative map on this site several years ago. An industrial use would use far less water than residential so this will have a positive effect on reducing the water demand, as well as reducing the amount of effluent that is passed on to the sewer treatment plant. This is an ideal site for an industrial project. The applicant is in full agreement with the staff report and can make all the findings.

Nathan Gilbert, Associate Planner, concurred with the applicant's presentation. Any development of the site would require an SUP and specific development parameters would be evaluated at that time. Staff can make the findings and suggests a recommendation of approval to the City Council.

Commissioner Coffman disclosed that he has visited the site. The remaining Commissioners present disclosed that they have visited the site and received emails.

At this time, Chairman Woosley opened public comment for this item.

Manuel Figuerredom, 7500 Tholl Road, spoke in opposition of the requested amendments expressing concern regarding potential additional traffic.

Chairman Woosley read written comments submitted by Danielle Hammons in opposition of the requested amendments.

"I am a homeowner in the subdivision and will directly be affected by the increased traffic, reduced home values, and noise distraction. I do not wish to see this area re-zoned."

Tony Novelly expressed concerns regarding idling time for trucks and the need for sound walls. Mr. Novelly suggested positioning the buildings in such a way that would help contain the sound rather than pointing outward toward residents adjacent to the property.

Seeing and hearing no further public comment requests, Chairman Woosley closed public comment.

Mr. Gilbert confirmed that any project proposed on this site will require an SUP. During the SUP process issues like lighting, truck idling, traffic study, project specific characteristics, and mitigations would be analyzed.

Commissioner Reno expressed concerns with having an Industrial Use area surrounded by Residential with no other land use buffers around it.
Commissioner Weiske provided examples of other areas where Industrial Use is near or adjacent to Residential. This zone change allows the developer to design a project. That project will be brought forward to the Planning Commission to condition and modify to protect the interest of the neighbors.

**A motion was made by Commissioner Coffman, seconded by Commissioner Weiske, in the case of LDC15-00035 (0 Lemmon Drive & 0 Military Road MPA/ZMA), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to recommend that City Council adopt the Master Plan amendment by resolution subject to a finding of conformance with the Regional Planning Commission. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER</td>
<td>Doug D. Coffman, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER</td>
<td>Kevin Weiske, Vice-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES</td>
<td>Woosley, Coffman, Reno, Weiske, Olivas, Gower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT</td>
<td>Kathleen Taylor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Motion:** Motion for zoning map amendment 7:56 PM

**A motion was made by Commissioner Coffman, seconded by Commissioner Weiske, in the case of LDC15-00035 (0 Lemmon Drive & 0 Military Road MPA/ZMA), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to recommend that City Council approve the zoning map amendment by ordinance. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT</th>
<th>ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER</td>
<td>Doug D. Coffman, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER</td>
<td>Kevin Weiske, Vice-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES</td>
<td>Woosley, Coffman, Reno, Weiske, Olivas, Gower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT</td>
<td>Kathleen Taylor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6 **Staff Report (For Possible Action):** Case No. LDC15-00039 (Southern Edge) - A request has been made for a special use permit: 1) to allow more than 4 multifamily units on a site in the Arterial Commercial (AC) zone; and for a Hillside Development to develop a 56 unit apartment complex. The ±10.42 acre site will be accessed from Mica Place from the west and is located on the west side of North Virginia Street just north of its intersection with Moraine Way in the AC zone. The site has a Master Plan land use designation of Urban Residential/Commercial. vak [Ward 4] 8:00 PM

Chairman Woosley called for a break at 7:58 p.m. The meeting resumed at 8:10 p.m.
Mike Railey, Rubicon Design Group, stated that this project has been approved twice previously. Mr. Railey reviewed information regarding the requested SUP and stated that the density is reduced from the previous approvals. The parking for this project exceeds code by 43 spaces and is compatible with the adjoining uses. Mr. Railey addressed Mr. Aguilar's concerns regarding parking and drainage. The applicant concurs with all the Conditions in the staff report.

Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, stated that staff believes the design of the project is compatible with the area and meets the Hillside Ordinance Standards. There is a Condition recommended to make the created slopes blend in with the existing slopes. Adequate parking and buffering is provided. There will be minimal window impacts on the residents to the west. Staff received a few phone calls regarding various concerns that would be addressed in the building plans. Staff believes all the findings can be made and is recommending approval.

The Commissioners present disclosed that they have visited the site and received emails.

At this time, Chairman Woosley opened public comment for this item.

Richard Aguilar, Vice President of the Home Owner's Association (HOA) for The Edge at Reno, expressed concerns regarding the proposed project. The HOA will be meeting at the end of the month and is requesting a postponement of this project so they can have an opportunity to review the environmental impact study and address concerns regarding drainage.

Jane Taber spoke in opposition of the proposed project and expressed concern regarding previous buildings that were removed from the site because they were sliding down the hill.

Tom Taber spoke in opposition of the proposed project and expressed concern regarding excavation difficulties, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and water pressure issues.

Seeing and hearing no further public comment requests, Chairman Woosley closed public comment.

Commissioner Weiske asked about drainage issues that staff has reviewed on the submitted plans.

Bill Gall, Senior Civil Engineer, explained how the drainage issues will be addressed. The development is not allowed to increase the actual peak flows from the site and they
will provide on-site detention. They have also been conditioned to take a look at the existing crossing at Moraine for the existing ditch to ensure that it is functional.

Commissioner Weiske asked whether there is a need for a traffic study.

Mr. Gall stated that the existing street network can support the additional trip generation.

Commissioner Coffman asked about Condition No. 10 regarding alcohol awareness.

Mr. Kloos explained that Condition was recommended by the Police Department because of the location to the university and because the project is primarily intended for college students.

There was discussion regarding bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Mr. Railey confirmed that there are bicycle and pedestrian paths to the edge of the property. There is also a Condition to provide a pedestrian path down to the corner of North Virginia Street and Moraine Way.

Chairman Woosley asked where the pedestrian path might be located.

Mr. Railey stated they will work with staff to finalize that location.

Mr. Gall stated that there is a sanitary sewer line that would be an excellent place for the pedestrian path.

Chairman Woosley read the appeal process into the record.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Housing Manager, stated that anybody aggrieved has the ability to appeal. It would then be heard by City Council. If it is not appealed, then it would go to building permit.

A motion was made by Commissioner Gower, seconded by Commissioner Coffman, in the case of LDC15-00039 (Southern Edge), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to approve the special use permit, subject to conditions. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.
RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Peter Gower, Commissioner
SECONDER: Doug D. Coffman, Commissioner
AYES: Woosley, Coffman, Reno, Weiske, Olivas, Gower
ABSENT: Kathleen Taylor

6.7 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Case No. LDC15-00029 (Sierra Senior Care PUD Amendment) - A request has been made for a zoning map amendment to amend the Sierra Senior Care Planned Unit Development (PUD) Handbook to add a two story, 44 unit multi-family development as an alternative to the assisted living/skilled nursing use designated for the south ±1.91 acres of the ±5.09 acre PUD. The ±5.09 acre PUD is located in the area bounded by Mountain View Drive to the north just south of its intersection with Audubon Way and Beck Street to the east, in the PUD zone. The site has Master Plan land use designations of Mixed Residential (3-21 units/acre) and Urban Residential/Commercial. 

Angela Fuss, CFA, representing the applicant, reviewed the history of the site and details of the amendment request. Since 2011 the property has remained as a PUD and has sat vacant. The applicant has come forward with a request to change the PUD on the south 1.9 acres of the site. This area was initially proposed to be a 94 bed skilled nursing facility. The request is to change that to allow the option to construct a 44 unit, two-story, multi-family affordable housing project. This project would be specific to veterans with affordable housing needs. The veterans would have to meet a certain income requirement. It is not a Section 8 housing project. Ms. Fuss explained the funding source stipulations regarding who will be allowed to live in these units. Those stipulations gave the neighbors more assurance about the type of people that will live there. Veterans will be given first preference but not all tenants are required to be veterans. This project is shown in the Handbook as an alternative so if for some reason it does not go forward, it reverts back to the original nursing facility.

Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, presented the request. There are standards in the Handbook to address existing development and also standards proposed to address the development of the 44 unit apartments with regard to landscaping and other site plan issues. The operators and on-site staff are required to receive Crime Free Multi-Family Housing Training. The project is required to be continuously maintained including building exteriors and landscaping. Staff believes all appropriate issues have been addressed with this revision of the Handbook.

The Commissioners present disclosed that they have visited the site and spoken with the applicant's representative.
At this time, Chairman Woosley opened public comment for this item.

Ken Krater spoke in favor of the project and suggested changing the language in the Handbook regarding the requirement that a 6 foot chain link fence with green slats be built around the property. The proposed language change would allow the recently built 5 foot chain link fence to be filled with green slats and remain in place instead of tearing it down to build a new 6 foot fence.

Chairman Woosley read written comments submitted by Lewis Gage in favor of the project.

"The proposed project on this property will be an improvement to the neighborhood and should be built for many good reasons."

Chairman Woosley read written comments submitted by Carmen Gage in favor of the project.

"As a member of the CCANA residents that met with Mr. Ken Krater and Mr. Matthew Fleming to voice our concerns regarding the proposed amendment to the Sierra Senior Care Planning Unit Development Handbook. A few years ago members of the CCANA Board when Mr. Krater made a concerted effort to come to an agreement on the Sierra Senior Care Planning Unit Development for the property of the Mountain View Drive. Since then an amendment to the Senior Care Planned Unit Development Handbook has been requested. Our concern with the newly proposed PUD amendment was the possibility of the PUD being completely eliminated. However, since our meetings, wording to the proposed amendment has helped reassure us that the PUD will remain in place. I quote, "proposed processing the project through the PUD rather than through the straight zoning is to allow for a more cohesive design of the overall development and to provide the neighborhood with a level of assurance as to what can be developed on that site". I therefore ask the proposed amendment to the Sierra Senior Care Planning Unit Development Handbook be approved."

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Housing Manager, read and summarized written comments submitted by Donna Keats in opposition of the proposed amendment.

"I oppose the request for a zoning map amendment to the Sierra Senior Care Planned Unit Development Handbook. The PUD approved for this site was a product of approximately four years of meetings between the developer, area residents, the NAB and the Planning Commission. At all of these meetings prior to the PUD development proposal, area residents expressed concern about increased density, multi-family
housing, and crime in an existing high density and high crime rate area, as well as increased traffic and impact to Virginia Lake Park.

The 2010 proposal to re-zone the property as a PUD was conceptualized specifically to address neighbor's concerns by memorializing the designated land uses and types of development that could occur on this parcel. The PUD restricts the property land use to three types of senior uses and specifically excludes other uses, including multi-family development. The senior uses, compared to other multi-family uses, were described as a means to help protect the integrity and character of the adjacent neighborhoods and Virginia Lake Park. The PUD designation also resolved neighbor's concerns about land development in the event that the property was sold.

The Sierra Senior Care PUD has not been developed since it was approved in 2011. The current proposal to amend the PUD zoning was instigated by an opportunity to sell part of the property. The buyer cannot develop the property in the absence of this zoning amendment. Approval of the proposed zone change negates much of the intent of establishing the PUD.

No compelling reasons to change the land uses for the PUD have been presented. Neither a "needs study" nor a neighborhood assessment supporting the appropriateness of low income housing at this location has been presented. If the amendment is approved, the developer's opportunity cost will be paid by the area residents who worked with the developer to define a compromise between property development and limiting impact to surrounding areas.

I am submitting written comments for entry into the public record. The following information is attached for your consideration prior to taking action on the proposed zone change."

(The following portion of the submitted comment was summarized by Ms. Hanson. The complete written statement is on file.)

Comments regarding the time-frame for expiration, she sites certain sections of the Handbook. The time-frame for the expiration of the zone amendment needs to be shortened. The conditions for expiration need to be tied to project construction, not submittal of the building permit.

She sites NRS 278A.410. The proposed zone change disrupts the cohesive use and intent of the existing PUD. The existing senior use zoning provides for independent living, assisted living/skilled nursing, and memory care.
Page 11 of the staff report regarding finding 2b. The zone change would undo the limited impact of the senior uses designated in the PUD. Although the number of dwelling units for the multifamily project is slightly less than the nursing facility, the possible impact on the Lake and surrounding areas is greater.

And then 2C. Not granted solely to confer a private benefit upon any person. Although the zone change may not confer a private benefit solely to any person, the zone change proposal was generated by opportunities for sales and development of part of the PUD property.

And land use compatibility, she does not believe it is compatible. There are unmitigated traffic impacts.

And the relationship beneficial or adverse for the proposed PUD. Comments by the Reno Police Department do not support it. And the PUD states NNCHRB or comparable nonprofit organization may develop and operate the affordable housing project.

Seeing and hearing no further public comment requests, Chairman Woosley closed public comment.

Ms. Fuss and Bill Gall, Senior Civil Engineer, spoke regarding plans for pedestrian connections and the use of a traffic calming device to reduce the speeds of people coming down Mountain View Drive.

Commissioner Gower asked if the site would be accessible for multi-modal transit.

Ms. Fuss identified the locations of RTC bus stops currently available near the site.

There was discussion regarding the vinyl coated fence requirement and whether green slates could be used in the existing 5 foot fence.

Mr. Kloos explained the original reason for the vinyl coating was that they didn't want just a straight chain link fence. The idea was to provide the separation while minimizing the impact of the fence line. Adding green slats into the existing fence would make the fence more apparent.

Commissioner Weiske pointed out that adding green slats in the existing fence would also cause more potential for graffiti.
There was discussion regarding changing the language in the Handbook to give the option of using either the existing 5 foot fence or installing a new 6 foot fence.

Mr. Kloos summarized the Commission's intent regarding the fence requirements stating that either a 6 foot tall or a 5 foot tall vinyl coated chain link fence will be required.

Ms. Fuss stated that in order to address one of the concerns, they would like to change language in the Handbook to reflect that the Northern Nevada Community Housing Resource Board (NNCHRB) nonprofit group is the only one that can develop this project.

Mr. Kloos stated that staff is okay with the language change regarding limiting the developer as suggested by the applicant.

There was discussion regarding the option to extend beyond 5 years.

Ms. Fuss reviewed the timeline in the Handbook and explained that because it is an affordable housing project there is a requirement to apply for two different affordable housing funding sources before it can go to construction. If funding from one of those sources is not granted, they have to wait another year to apply again. The concern is that possible delay in funding. Having the option to extend in five years would give the nonprofit group the option to continue working on the affordable housing funding component. If it doesn't work and they pull out, it reverts back to the skilled nursing facility.

A motion was made by Commissioner Weiske, seconded by Commissioner Reno, in the case of LDC15-00029 (Sierra Senior Care PUD Amendment), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to recommend that City Council approve the amendment to the PUD Handbook, subject to Condition A as written, and subject to the modification to the fence requirement as provided by staff so that the west boundary fence will be one continuous height of a vinyl coated fabric from end to end, and limiting the affordable housing developer to the NNCHRB as proposed by the applicant. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.
RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Kevin Weiske, Vice-Chair
SECONDER: Charles Reno, Commissioner
AYES: Woosley, Coffman, Reno, Weiske, Olivas, Gower
ABSENT: Kathleen Taylor

6.8 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Case No. TXT14-00004 (Recreation Uses In Greenfield Neighborhood Plan) – An ordinance amending Reno Municipal Code Title 18 “Annexation and Land Development” Chapter 18.08 in order to allow certain recreation uses with a special use permit within the Greenfield Single-Family District (GFSF) zone, together with other matters properly relating thereto. njg [Ward 2] 9:42 PM

Mr. Gilbert presented the text amendment. The City Council initiated a text amendment to facilitate indoor recreation uses within the Greenfield Neighborhood Plan area. Because the parcel is deed restricted to only allow for recreational use, Washoe County Parks staff has requested that the amendment be expanded from the City Council's initial request to include outdoor recreation and parks uses as well. A noticed neighborhood meeting was held in October and neighborhood concerns were primarily related to potential building esthetics, noise, traffic impacts, and impacts on property values. Any development here would require an SUP where those impacts would be evaluated by the Planning Commission. Staff can make the applicable findings.

Commissioner Weiske asked Legal Counsel whether he needs to recuse himself from this item since his residential property is adjacent to Greenfield but he is not a part of the Greenfield HOA.

Karl Hall, City Attorney, stated that a disclosure will satisfy any requirements and would not require a recusal.

Commissioner Weiske disclosed that he lives adjacent to the site but that it will not influence his decision tonight.

The remaining Commissioners present disclosed that they have visited the site.

At this time, Chairman Woosley opened public comment for this item.

Jeff Heinzen spoke in opposition stating that allowing a recreational facility might have an adverse effect on the rural nature of the properties there.

Ken Krater stated that he is looking for the opportunity to come forward with an SUP for an indoor recreational facility. He stated that they can put together a project that is
compatible with the neighborhood, and can move the project down about 10 feet in elevation from the roadway.

Eric Mortensen spoke against the amendment and in favor of maintaining the rural atmosphere of the community.

Seeing and hearing no further public comment requests, Chairman Woosley closed public comment.

Commissioner Weiske asked if the site is in the Greenfield Neighborhood Plan or across the street from it.

Mr. Gilbert stated that the property is within the Greenfield Neighborhood Plan on the north side of Moana.

Commissioner Weiske asked if the proposed indoor tennis facility has anything to do with the existing outdoor facility next to it.

Mr. Gilbert replied no and stated that Council directed staff to create a text amendment to allow for an indoor tennis facility. The closest definition is Commercial Amusement Recreation Indoors. That would allow for a variety of things subject to an SUP.

Commissioner Weiske asked if this text amendment would allow development of the facility without it coming back before the Planning Commission with an SUP request.

Mr. Gilbert replied no. The text amendment does not allow any project to be built without an SUP.

Commissioner Reno asked if staff is requesting outside recreation as well.

Mr. Gilbert stated that Washoe County Parks staff is requesting that because they would like options for park use with outdoor recreation.

_It was moved by Commissioner Reno, seconded by Commissioner Gower, in the case of TXT14-00004 (Recreation Uses in Greenfield Neighborhood Plan), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to recommend that City Council approve the text amendment by ordinance with the addition of "Commercial Amusement/Recreation (Outside)" and "Public Park or Recreation Area" land uses. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present._
7 Discussion and possible initiation to amend RMC Title 18 regarding the standards and requirements related to Hazardous Waste. (For Possible Action)

Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, presented the request. This text amendment came to the forefront based on existing leases in areas that are zoned MU in the West 4th Street Transit Corridor. These areas were historically Industrial and when they changed over the hazardous waste use was pulled out as an allowable use. That particular use is highly regulated by the Health Department, the NDEP, the Fire Department, and Environmental Control. So whether or not an SUP is required, if someone is operating a facility that processes, stores, or generates hazardous waste, there are regulations in place right now that have to be followed. If directed to prepare the amendment, staff would meet with various agencies that regulate hazardous waste and outline what the parameters are and the safeguards that are in place for this use. Staff would then make a recommendation for consideration by the Planning Commission to determine whether or not it is appropriate to add the use as allowed or add it in circumstances that require an SUP.

At this time, Chairman Woosley opened public comment for this item.

Angela Fuss, CFA, spoke in support of staff’s recommendation to move forward with taking this out of the TOD and zoning in general as a requirement that triggers an SUP.

Mr. Kloos stated that because the use is fully regulated by other agencies it is being regulated whether or not an SUP is required. Since the use is regulated by other agencies, another option is to determine if the use is put on the use chart with an SUP or just eliminated altogether.

Seeing and hearing no further public comment requests, Chairman Woosley closed public comment.

Commissioner Weiske stated that if the use is left to the agencies who inspect and enforce it, then the surrounding neighbors would not be notified of the potential that a facility like the oil recycling plant could be moving into their neighborhood. This would be one of those times where it is good to have the SUP process in place and require it to be part of a public process.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Housing Manager, stated that if the Commission chooses to initiate, staff would do a full analysis of what other jurisdictions do, noticing possibilities, requiring an SUP permit or not, and what the existing regulations are. That analysis would be brought back to the Planning Commission for consideration.
It was moved by Commissioner Reno, seconded by Commissioner Weiske, to direct staff to prepare recommendations and review Title 18 for hazardous waste. The motion carried unanimously with six (6) members present.

8 Discussion regarding last minute changes and multiple motions for projects. (For Possible Action)

Commissioner Weiske stated this request was made to discuss last minute changes made by applicant's and applicant's representatives that are brought to the podium without giving the Commissioners appropriate time to research and study them. Commissioner Weiske asked for input from staff and Legal Counsel regarding what time limit can be set legally for submitting changes and comments on projects.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated that on a public hearing item, notice is given 10 days before as listed by State Law and in the RMC. The public hearing is noticed for 6:00 p.m. and typically public comment can be received until the time public comment is closed by the Commission during the meeting. There may not be time to get through it at that time. Notifications can be put on the website that time is limited but the public cannot be kept from submitting additional information up until public comment is closed.

Commissioner Olivas clarified that this came up because of some significant changes to what was submitted by an applicant and/or staff in that instance.

Karl Hall, City Attorney, stated that with the past issue there was no opportunity to review the late submitted materials in order to formulate the motion and it created chaos. Mr. Hall suggested recommending to the applicant one of two things: either go forward and not consider the information that was submitted late; or continue the matter to another time when the Commission has an opportunity to review and consider the materials. If materials are submitted late, that agenda item could be taken out of order so the issue can be addressed before everyone sits in the meeting for a couple of hours only to find out it will not be considered.

Chairman Woosley asked Ms. Fuss for input on this issue from an applicant's perspective.

Angela Fuss, CFA, stated that once an applicant submits an application, it is two months before the Planning Commission sees it and there are a lot of changes that can happen in that time. Neighbors could call with complaints and by the time it can be addressed, the staff report may have already been distributed.

Chairman Woosley stated that the Commission is not always aware of large changes coming up but staff or the applicant may be. Chairman Woosley asked for input regarding how best to communicate that information in a timely manner.
Mr. Hall stated that Ms. Hanson can always communicate with Legal Counsel's office and reach out to the Chairman to indicate when there is a change or something on the horizon that appears as though it will take some time for the rest of the Commission to get up to speed.

Chairman Woosley asked if the item could then be postponed either before the meeting or after the presentation.

Ms. Hanson stated that it is not always the Commission's decision to continue an item. Some items have a limited time frame. SUPs and variances have to be voted on within 65 days of application.

Commissioner Weiske asked if an item with changes that may take a long time to review can be moved to the end of the agenda out of respect for other applicants that may be waiting for their items to be addressed.

Ms. Hanson replied yes, agenda items can be postponed to the end of the agenda. The Chairman has the ability at any time to rearrange the agenda.

Commissioner Reno stated that the responsibility is on the Commissioners to be more pro-active in noticing when items may need to be moved to the end of the agenda.

Ms. Hanson added that the Chairman is responsible for keeping the meeting moving along in a timely fashion.

9 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report

Commissioner Weiske stated that Commissioner Olivas will attend the Regional Planning Commission meeting as an alternate this month.

10 Staff Announcements

10.1 Report on status of Planning Division projects.

10.2 Announcement of upcoming training opportunities.

10.3 Report on status of responses to staff direction received at previous meetings.

10.4 Report on actions taken by City Council on previous Planning Commission items.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Housing Manager, stated that she has nothing to report other than the meeting in two weeks to discussion the Master Plan.

11 Commissioner's Suggestions for Future Agenda Items (For Possible Action)
Claudia Hanson, Planning and Housing Manager, reported that a discussion for appointments to the Regional Planning Commission will be added to the January 21st meeting.

Commissioner Reno requested a presentation from the Graffiti Task Force with information on tools and technology available.

12 Public Comment

None

13 Adjournment (For Possible Action)

The meeting was adjourned at 10:32 p.m.